

## **REMARKS**

Receipt of the Office Action of October 30, 2006 is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 1 - 11 were cancelled and replaced with claims 12 - 22 by the Preliminary Amendment filed on May 19, 2005.

Claims 12 - 22 have been examined. The examination produced the following results: claims 12 - 16 and 18 - 22 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Letton in view of Eryurek et al; and claim 17 has been objected to, but indicated as containing allowable subject matter.


To place this application in condition for allowance, claims 12 and 17 have been combined in claim 12 as amended. Accordingly, claims 12 - 16 are in prima facie condition for allowance.

Of the remaining claims, claim 18 is in independent form. It has been rejected as noted above. In discussing the rejection, the examiner does not mention claim 18 specifically, except to group it with the discussion of claim 12. Claim 12, however, is cast as a method claim, whereas claim 18 is cast as a device claim. To place claim 18 in condition for allowance, it has been amended to also include the subject matter of claim 17, except that the addition has been cast in structural form. That is, the additions have been "structuralized." The addition of these features to claim 18, should, as the additions to claim 12, result in the allowance of claim 18, and the allowance of claims 19 - 22 as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and re-examination are respectively requested and claims 12 - 16 and 18 - 22 found allowable.

Respectfully submitted,  
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

Date: January 30, 2007



Felix J. D'Ambrosio  
*Attorney for Applicant*  
Registration Number 25,721

**Customer Number \*23364\***  
**BACON & THOMAS, PLLC**  
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Telephone: (703) 683-0500  
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

S:\Producer\fyd\CLIENTS\Endress+Hauser Holding GmbH\FROH3004-FL0174\Jan 30 2007 Response.wpd